1974

The Roles of Area Specialized Positions as Perceived by Mississippi Extension Personnel.

James Ralph Carpenter
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALIZED POSITIONS AS PERCEIVED BY MISSISSIPPI EXTENSION PERSONNEL

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

in

The Department of Extension Education

by

James Ralph Carpenter
B.S., Mississippi State University, 1955
M.S., Mississippi State University, 1967

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: James Ralph Carpenter

Major Field: Extension Education

Title of Thesis: The Roles of Area Specialized Positions as Perceived By Mississippi Extension Personnel

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

March 26, 1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the personnel of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service who cooperated in making this study possible.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. W. M. Bost, Director of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service, for his understanding and encouragement during the pursuit of the graduate program.

The author is grateful to Dr. L. L. Pesson, chairman of the author's graduate committee, for his counsel and guidance during the course of this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to the other members of the author's graduate committee: Dr. J. H. Jones, Dr. Edward W. Gassie, Dr. Alvin Bertrand and Dr. Leo J. Guedry, for their suggestions and assistance.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. A. L. McLaughlin and Dr. Verner G. Hurt for their advice on and assistance with the statistical evaluation of the data.

Appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Pequita Denson for typing the manuscript and to Mrs. Lea Pitre for typing and assisting with the questionnaires.

Finally, the author is especially appreciative of his wife and three children for their patience, understanding and encouragement throughout the graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study involved determining Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's perception of (1) the role of extension; (2) the role of area specialists, and (3) the role of area agents. Then to determine the relationship between a number of independent variables, i.e., perceived role of extension, job classification, sex, academic degree attainment, tenure, race, evaluation rating and work location and Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

A mailed questionnaire was used to measure Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's perception of the role of extension, the role of area specialists and the role of area agents. Each respondent was scored on a 1 to 5 scale. The assigned score value of 1 represented a "traditional" perception and the assigned value of 5 represented an "innovative" perception. A composite score was then computed for all respondents with regard to their perception of the role of extension, their perception of the role of area specialists and their perception of the role of area agents.

The respondents' scores for the role of extension were used as one of the independent variables. The respondents' scores for the role of area specialists and area agents and a combination of these scores were used as the dependent variables.

Multiple regression analysis was used to indicate what portion of the variance for the dependent variables had been accounted for by

the independent variables considered. Analysis of variance was used to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the combination of independent variables and each dependent variable. A t test was applied to each independent variable with regard to its relationship to each dependent variable. Standardized partial regression coefficients were computed for each independent variable to obtain some measure of the relative influence each independent variable had upon each dependent variable.

It was found that a majority of Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel tended to have an "innovative" perception of the role of extension. Their perception of the role of area specialists was only slightly weighted toward what is termed "innovative" and they are fairly evenly distributed between a "traditional" and an "innovative" perception of the role of area agents.

A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between (1) Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's perception of the role of extension and their perception of the role of area specialists; (2) Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's job classification and the perception of the role of the area specialized positions; (3) Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's race and their perception of the role of the area specialized positions.

When all independent variables were considered together, a statistically significant relationship was found to exist between these and Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's perception of the role of the area specialized positions.

It was found that the independent variables considered in this study only accounted for a relatively small amount of the variance measured for the dependent variables.

Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel's job classification more strongly influenced their perception of the role of the area specialized positions than did any of the other independent variables.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Since its inception over a half century ago, the Cooperative Extension Service has concentrated its efforts toward carrying out its assigned responsibilities as stated in the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914 (23). This Act describes the responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service as "...diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects related to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage application of the same...". The philosophy of the Cooperative Extension Service is to help people help themselves in attaining a higher level of living and a more satisfying and abundant life.

Sanders (12, p. 28) stated that following passage of the Smith-Lever Act, questions arose concerning its operation. The Act provided for agricultural extension work to be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture in a manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the land-grant universities. To establish this working relationship, a Memorandum of Understanding was developed and signed by the United States Department of Agriculture and the various states (22). This memorandum specified the general responsibilities of the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and

universities in carrying out cooperative extension work. The final decision on how this work is to be organized and implemented, however, resides with each state extension service (22).

The flexibility which the Memorandum of Understanding allows has resulted in each state developing the type of organizational structure they feel is best adapted to meet the educational needs of the people of their state. To varying degrees, each state has developed and is operating an organizational structure that is unique. States have also felt free to make changes and adjustments in their organizational structure in order to keep pace with the changing needs of the people they serve.

Changing the role of various personnel positions and the addition of new positions to assume new roles are methods frequently used by state extension service directors in an attempt to adapt their organizational structure to more effectively serve the changing educational needs of clientele. In recent years, extension directors across the nation have begun to perceive the need for more specialization. Many have added new area positions. These positions have been designated variously as area specialists and area agents.

A study conducted in 1962 by Dotson, Frutchey and Groening (20) points out some of the reasons why area positions were added to the extension service in various states. In this study, extension administrators in the fifty states and Puerto Rico were surveyed in regard to area extension work. The following reasons were given by them for employing area workers:

1. To provide organizational and educational leadership in new or specialized programs,
2. To provide greater depth in teaching,
3. To provide competency not provided by county staffs,
4. To provide opportunities for specialized staff to assist program planning groups,
5. To provide greater individual consultation with clientele, and
6. To provide opportunities to work on an industry or larger geographic basis.

The Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service is following this nationwide trend toward area specialization by the addition or reassignment of personnel to area agent and area specialist positions. In the calendar year 1971, the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service added 15 area agents and five area specialists to its organizational structure. In calendar year 1972, 6 area agents and 10 area specialists were added.

The administrative staff of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service plans to continue this move toward increased area specialization as indicated by the budget request submitted to the Mississippi State Legislature for fiscal year 1973-74. The request includes funds to be used to employ five additional area specialists.

Statement of the Problem

The problem upon which this study is based can be viewed from both a pragmatic and theoretical perspective.

When viewed from a pragmatic perspective the problem becomes one of determining how personnel of an organization perceive the role of newly created area agent and area specialist positions. The organization under study here is the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service. As stated above this organization is making a deliberate move toward increased area specialization through staffing adjustments.

When new positions are added within an organization, it must be decided how these positions will function in relation to other positions. Since area agent and area specialist positions are fairly new to the personnel of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service,[1] there may be a lack of clear understanding concerning the role of these positions. The lack of mutual understanding of the role of various positions within an organization can lead to serious consequences. For, as Bernard (1, p. 43) points out, a role cannot be performed alone; it must always have a counterpart. Thus, confusion on the part of one performer spreads to those who are performing with him.

Lack of agreement on role expectation can result in role conflict. When a person perceives himself in a role conflict situation in which there are two incompatible expectations, there are four alternative behaviors available by which he can resolve the conflict. Gross et al (5, p. 42) said that in an effort to resolve role conflict, a person may (1) conform to the first expectation, (2) conform to the

---

[1]Hereafter Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service will be referred to as MCES.

second expectation, (3) perform some compromise behavior which represents an attempt to conform in part to both expectations, or (4) attempt to avoid conforming to either expectation.

If the before mentioned changes that the MCES is making in its organizational structure are to be effective in helping MCES better serve a broader range of educational needs of clientele, then the personnel of the organization must perceive correctly the role of these new positions. If a majority of the personnel of MCES perceive these new positions only as additional staff resources available to continue the educational programs traditionally conducted, then the organizational changes will not likely have the intended effect without further efforts to correct these misconceptions. On the other hand, if a majority of the personnel of MCES perceive the new area positions as a means of providing a broader range of educational programs for clientele, then future efforts can be devoted to programming that will reinforce the correct perception rather than efforts to correct a misconception.

From a theoretical perspective the problem becomes one of empirically testing the effect of prior experiences and environment as they relate to perception. As agreed to by Weiss (17, p. 117), Stodgill (15, p. 72), Hilgard (6, p. 587), Dember (3, p. 3) and further reinforced by Ittelson and Cantril (7, p. 587), Combs (2, p. 20) and Jones (8, p. 236), the prior experiences and environment of an individual greatly influence his perception. Since it seems logical to assume that a great deal of variability may exist with regard to the experiences and environment of the subjects for this

study, i.e., personnel of the MCES, the relationship between prior experiences and environment of these subjects and their perception of area agent and area specialist positions will be tested to further determine the nature of these relationships as compared with existing knowledge.

Objectives of the Study

In keeping with the problem as stated, the major objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To determine how personnel of the MCES perceive the role[1] of area agents and area specialists.
2. To determine how personnel of the MCES perceive the general role of the extension service.
3. To determine if certain variables, i.e., perceived general role of extension, job classification, sex, academic degree attainment, tenure, race, evaluation rating, or work location of extension personnel influence how they perceive the role of area agents and area specialists.

Definition of Terms

Throughout this study, certain terms or concepts will be used. These terms may have meanings which differ somewhat from one individual to another. Therefore, the following definitions are stated to insure a clearer understanding of how they are used in this particular study.

---

[1]Role in this sense includes plural roles.

Cooperative Extension Service - The Cooperative Extension Service is an educational service administered jointly by the United States Department of Agriculture and the state land-grant college or university, in cooperation with local government and local people. The terms extension, extension service, and state extension services are used interchangeably for the term Cooperative Extension Service. When reference is made to the Cooperative Extension Service that serves the State of Mississippi this organization is identified by the name Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service or MCES.

Area Agent - This is a professional position in the MCES. Persons occupying these positions are assigned to work in a geographical area that includes more than one county and are assigned specific work tasks that may be identified according to a specific subject matter, a combination of subject matters, or which may be identified by the designation of a specific clientele group.

Area Specialist - This is a professional position in the MCES. Persons occupying these positions are required to have attained at least a Master's degree in the subject matter area to which they are assigned. They are members of an extension subject matter department and are assigned to work in a specific geographical area of the state.

State-Level Personnel - The term encompasses subject matter specialists, members of district supervisory teams, and administrative personnel employed by the MCES.

County-Level Personnel - This term includes all personnel of the MCES who hold the title of county leader, associate county agent, assistant county agent, extension home economist, associate extension home economist or assistant extension home economist.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine MCES personnel's perception of (1) the role of extension, (2) the role of area specialists, and (3) the role of area agents. The relationship between certain independent variables and the personnel's perception of the role of area specialists and area agents formed the theoretical base of the study.

In preparation for this study a search of existing literature was conducted in order to identify the research and thinking that has already been done on this and related problems. This study was then planned so as to tie in with this work in as many points as was possible.

This chapter summarizes previous research that is related to the problem under study and attempts to organize this work into the conceptual framework under which this study was conducted.

Perception Defined

Since this study has been based upon the ways personnel of the MCES perceive the role of area specialists and area agents, it is necessary at the outset to define perception.

Starting first with a definition by Webster (16, p. 318), he defines perception as "...the ability to grasp mentally or to become

aware through the senses. It is the faculty of gaining knowledge and insight."

Weiss (17, p. 117) defines perception as "part of the process of living by which each of us, from his own particular point of view creates for himself the world within, in which one has experiences and through which one strives to gain satisfaction."

Stodgill (15, p. 72) stresses the point that an individual's perception of a situation is influenced by the individual's experience, environment, and his conscious or unconscious values and goals:

> Individuals tend to formulate judgments in terms of scales of estimate that appear to be related not only to the objective situation but also to their past experiences. Thus, an individual's perception of a situation is determined both by the information that he derives from the situation and by set or expectation in terms of which he views the situation. The desirability of a situation is estimated in reference to internalized scales and norms of value which are determined by past experience. That which conforms to these norms tends to be most readily perceived, and that which departs from the norms tends to be rejected.

Hilgard (6, p. 587) describes perception in the following terms:

> Perception is the process of becoming aware of objects, qualities or relationships by way of the sense organs. While sensory content is always present in perception, what is perceived is influenced by set and prior experiences so that perception is more than a passive registration of stimuli impinging on the sense organs.

Dember (3, p. 3) says that perception is difficult to define because it depends on the role that perception plays in one's general system of psychology. He states that, "perception is not a simple scientific concept but a more complicated construct, whose main function is to help organize knowledge and thereby facilitate communication."

Agreeing with Dember's statement that perception is difficult to define, certain points from definitions by Weiss, Stodgill, and Hilgard have been combined to form the definition of perception used in this study.

For this purpose perception was defined as the process of becoming aware of objects, qualities or relations by means of the sense organs. Sensory content is always present in perception but it is also influenced by set and prior experiences so that perception is more than a passive registration of stimuli impinging on sense organs. Further, the desirability of a situation is estimated in reference to internalized scales and norms of value which are determined by past experience. That which conforms to these norms, and poses the most likelihood of yielding satisfaction, tends to be most readily perceived. That which departs from the norms tends to be rejected.

Perceptual Influence

The above accepted definition of perception stresses the influence of set and prior experiences on the way an individual perceives a situation. Selected thinking from this review of the literature tends to reinforce this point.

According to Ittelson and Cantril (7, p. 587) perception has three major characteristics:

1. Perception can be studied only in terms of transactions, that is, concrete individuals dealing with concrete situations;

2. Perception comes into the transaction from the unique personal behavioral center of the perceiver;
3. Perception occurs as the perceiver creates his own psychological environment by identifying certain aspects of his own experiences with an environment which he believes exists independent of his own experiences.

This environment which the perceiver believes exists is described by Combs and Snygg (2, p. 20) as the perceptual field:

> Perceptual field includes the individual's world of personal experiences including the entire universe as experienced by the individual at the instance of action. The individual's perceptual field is in a continual state of change, and what he is aware of at any given moment depends largely upon his immediate needs.

A refinement of this explanation of how an individual's world of personal experiences influences his perception was advanced by Bruner and Postman (27, p. 142) by use of the concept "selective vigilance." This concept refers to:

> ...any given situation in which the organism singles out what it considers to be the environment's most relevant aspects. The perceptual field includes only a small part of the total range of percepts available as far as the objective situation is concerned. Attention is focused on some parts rather than others, and only a fraction of the stimulation from within the organism and field get through. Selection tends to be made on the basis of interest, needs, assumptions, attitudes, momentary motive patterns, and mental set.

In addition to those factors specifically identified by Bruner and Postman that influence perception, Jones (8, p. 236) pointed out the importance of one's values as related to perception:

> Things are seen more quickly or in more accentuated form when they support one's values than when they run counter to them. The individual tends to see desired things more rapidly than neutral things, to accentuate the attitudes that make them more vivid, and to have difficulty seeing unpleasant and threatening objects.

From the insight gained from reviewing what various authors had to say about perception and perceptual influence, this study was conducted with the awareness that the perception by extension personnel included in the study is dependent upon not only sensory factors but also their prior experience. Further, these prior experiences include such factors as interest, needs, assumptions, attitudes, momentary motive patterns, mental set, and values of the perceiver.

Role Defined

Since the concept "role" was an integral part of this study, some attention was given to defining this concept.

Bertrand (30, p. 27) defines roles in the following way:

> Roles are the second unit structure of social systems. They consist of a more or less integrated subset of norms. In other words, a role is made up of several related norms, all of which are dedicated to the same function. Roles are thus classifiable as supporters of social institutions, such as religion, education or the family. They also have dimensions or characteristics which serve to help in the prediction of behavior.

Newcomb (10, p. 280) states that the ways of behaving which are expected for an individual who occupies a certain position constitute the role associated with that position.

Znaniecki (18, p. 19) had the following to say about the concept role:

> There is obviously a fundamental and universal, though unreflective cultural pattern in accordance with which all kinds of lasting relationships between individuals and their social milieus are normatively organized and which we denote by the term social role.

Other definitions treat the concept role as an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and other's social position. An example of such a definition is one by Sargent (13, p. 359) who said, "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group." He goes on to point out that roles have ingredients of cultural, of personal, and of situational determination. But never is a role wholly cultural, wholly personal, or wholly situational.

One of Parson's (11, pp. 38-39) definitions of role reads as follows:

> A role... is a sector of the total orientation system of an individual actor which is organized about expectations in relation to a particular interaction context, that is integrated with a particular set of value-standards which govern interaction with one or more alters in the appropriate complementary roles.

Another of Parson's (11, p. 25) definitions of role is "...what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the content of its functional significance for the social system."

These various views of the concept "role" were used as the cognitive framework by which this concept was treated within the context of this study.

Perceptual Studies of the Extension Service's Role

The Cooperative Extension Service has developed in the direction of a democratic educational organization. The directions taken by

the Cooperative Extension Service have been determined to a large extent by the economic, social and educational needs of its clientele (19, p. 6).

Since the inception of the Cooperative Extension Service, three major perceptual studies of the role of extension have been conducted.

The first of these studies was conducted in 1946 and became commonly known as the "Kepner Report", since it was conducted under supervision of Mr. P. V. Kepner, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Extension Service.

The Kepner Report (21, p. 12) concluded that certain adjustments were needed in the distribution of extension staff resources if the extension service was to maintain a well balanced program of educational services. These needed adjustments were outlined under three major areas as follows:

1. A maximum increase in extension emphasis in the fields of economic problems and public policies; marketing and distribution; certain segments in the field of social relations and cultural values; farm and homes and buildings, and health, particularly with respect to developing a better understanding of the total rural health situation, and methods of improvement through group action.
2. A moderate increase in emphasis in the fields of conservation of natural resources, farm and home management, rural organization and leadership development.
3. Less emphasis in the field of production techniques.

The second major study entitled "The Cooperative Extension Service Today--A Statement of Scope and Responsibility" (24) was published in July, 1959. This statement described the kinds of changes that affect what the extension service should do and how such changes should be brought about. This statement was followed by a delineation of nine areas of program emphasis for the future. Four of these areas emphasized farming and agricultural production, i.e., (1) efficiency in agricultural production; (2) efficiency in marketing, distribution, and utilization; (3) conservation, development, and use of natural resources; and (4) management on the farm and in the home. The remaining five areas were concerned with education of family members for life in a modern society, i.e., (5) family living; (6) youth development, (7) leadership development; (8) community improvement and resource development; and (9) public affairs (24, p. 222).

The report concluded that new programs would be needed in the future which could not be handled by traditional methods of staffing and organization (24, p. 46).

A third major study of the extension service was completed in 1968 and published under the title "A People and A Spirit" (19).

The report offered numerous recommendations on the extension service role and responsibility for the future. The recommendations which dealt specifically with these roles and relationship responsibilities were as follows:

1. When the USDA or the universities contemplate major changes in program scope, direction, organization, or operations substantially affecting the Cooperative

Extension Service, the other partner should be fully involved in the decision.

2. The Cooperative Extension Service should be the "educational arm" of the USDA and educational support arm of other governmental agencies.
3. Extension should make conscious and deliberate efforts to strengthen the local Cooperative Extension Service office in its role as a primary source of information and focal referral point for the many programs involving direct relationships between units of government and the people, especially in rural areas.
4. The local Cooperative Extension Service office should be the public's point of contact for the entire land-grant university.
5. The existing relationships with county governments should be maintained. Efforts should be made to involve more city governments in the financial support of extension programs, especially those which are directed more toward urban audiences.
6. The appropriate point for administration of various extension functions funded from different sources within the Federal government should be at the university level.
7. The university administration should develop administrative mechanisms which will provide access to

and support from all colleges and departments which have competencies relevant to the extension function.

8. Continued official affiliation of Cooperative Extension with the extension section of the division of agriculture of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is appropriate for the USDA related role.
9. The organizational structure of the council on extension of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges should be modified to provide for participating membership for directors of the Cooperative Extension Service or their representatives in addition to continued membership in the division of agriculture.
10. A close and continuing working relationship should be maintained between the Extension Committee On Organization and Policy and the Office of International Programs of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
11. The Cooperative Extension Service should give increased attention to staff training and development.
12. The Cooperative Extension Service should cooperate more closely with other agencies and institutions.

In addition to these recommendations concerning roles and relationships of the Extension Service the report contains specific recommendations (19, p. 71) for the maximum effective use of its manpower resources by:

1. Employing more specialized area agents.
2. Upgrading the professional competence of personnel.
3. Increasing use of specialist holding joint research, teaching, and extension appointments.
4. Experimenting with new organizational structures such as multi-county staffing and specialist teams.
5. Employing personnel trained in disciplines relevant to the assigned educational role.
6. Increasing the use of consulting teams on a contract basis for special problems.
7. Increasing the use of non-extension personnel hired for specific work on a part-time, one-time, or periodic basis for help in disciplines not available on the regular staff.
8. Making the best use of available staff by utilizing new electronic teaching devices, new communications systems, and new teaching techniques.

The report contains a general conclusion (19, p. 73) in reference to the question of area specialization. This conclusion is:

> In projecting into the 1970's, it is apparent that one of the major organizational issues will be staffing at the local level. Patterns of staffing on other than a county basis will need to be seriously considered. With more knowledge calling for greater specialization, area programming may become a more practical approach than county programming... .

Area Specialization Studies

The literature revealed that a number of studies have been conducted on area specialization by the extension service. These

studies concentrated on various aspects of this relatively new staffing pattern.

A study (20, pp. 39-40) involving extension directors from 50 states and Puerto Rico, conducted by the Federal Extension Service identified several reasons for employing area extension personnel. These reasons are:

1. To develop organizational and educational leadership resources for new or special programs,
2. To deal intensively with particular or specialized problems,
3. To provide more highly trained personnel to secure greater depth in teaching,
4. To provide opportunity to work on an industry or a larger geographic basis, and
5. To provide personnel to work with special groups of clientele.

Another study (25, p. 42), conducted in 13 states having multi-county operations, revealed similar reasons for the trend toward area specialization. The report concluded that:

> The exploratory findings of this study indicate that area staffing offers good possibilities for increasing the effectiveness of several phases of extension work. The findings also strongly suggest that more detailed study and evaluation may be warranted than was possible under the framework of this study. Because of the rather significant differences, characteristics, and surroundings of the major program areas, it might be desirable to consider making further detailed study on a program-by-program basis. Relevant inter-relationships would not have to be ignored but with the primary focus on a given major program area more vigorous analysis could be obtained.

Based on the data collected in this 13-state study (25, p. 35), organizational arrangements for area work were found to be greatly varied. The patterns were grouped in four categories. These categories were as follows:

1. Administrative responsibility to district supervisors, with subject matter leadership and assistance provided by state specialists or program leaders.
2. Administrative responsibility to county chairmen (or directors) with subject matter leadership and assistance provided by state specialists or program leaders.
3. Administrative responsibility to area chairmen (or directors) with subject matter leadership and assistance provided by state specialists or program leaders.
4. Administrative responsibility to and subject matter leadership provided by state specialists or program leaders.

Deere (37) reported on a survey of the directors of cooperative extension in 12 states. This survey revealed:

1. The composition of the extension staff has become more specialized in recent years and the directors expect it to become more so. Directors in two regions expect the number of specialists to increase, especially at the regional level.
2. Although some increases are expected in fields such as sociology and adult education, few subject matter disciplines outside of agriculture are considered acceptable preparation at present.

3. Academic preparation will move up about one degree level by 1970. A few persons with Bachelor's degrees will be employed in generalist jobs at the county level, but specialist jobs at the county, area, or state levels will require at least a Master's degree.

Johnson (31, p. 12) reports on a case study of the transition to area extension work in Kansas. He concluded that:

> Communications problems are greatly aggravated by area extension work and must receive special attention. Communication with other professional staff members and clientele should be studied. These problems may be affected by application of modern technology such as some form of private line service between the assignment areas and the extension offices and automobile telephones for agents. Training of staff in inter-office communications procedures seems justified.

Ross (32, pp. 15-16) made the following recommendations based upon the finding of his study:

> State extension administrators need to establish a set of well-defined objectives, policies, and procedures to effectuate and to evaluate a multi-county system. Area agent selection and recruitment should receive considerable attention in administrative policy. Likewise, each area agent should be required to develop an effective plan for continuing education and professional improvement in his subject matter field and in teaching methods.
>
> Likewise, careful consideration should be given to clientele leadership, county commissioner functions, communications patterns and problems, and the socio-economic characteristics of the area prior to the implementation of the multi-county system.
>
> Once these factors have been considered and the multi-county system has been legitimized, a six to eight county area should be identified and subject matter area agents assigned to this area based upon the needs of the clientele.

McIntyre (39, pp. 129-130) concluded from his study, that, based on the responses of the known cooperators, general extension

programs are more effective under the traditional individual county assignment of agents than under the area agent system of personnel assignment. Under the individual county system he found known cooperators to be more satisfied, to participate at a higher level, and to adopt more practices than they do under the area system.

Based on the responses of the agents, it was concluded by McIntyre that agents in the individual county system spend significantly more time in organizing and planning and significantly less time in implementing the programs as compared to the agents in the multi-county system. It appears that this additional time devoted to organizing and planning results in more effective extension programs.

In a study conducted by Zettle (42, pp. 148-149) he arrived at the following conclusions:

> This study has identified some of the important administrative relationships and job tasks that should be considered in establising the area position. Several important decisions will need to be made by the individual organizations if they expect the incumbent in the area position to function effectively. It will be necessary to determine to what extent, if any, the positions will be associated with the subject matter department. This is directly related to maintaining the technical competency of the area specialist.
>
> Effective supervision and means of coordinating the activities of the area specialist and county agent will be needed. Probably, having the organizational and administrative relationships defined and understood is more important than the specific way the relationship exists... .
>
> Another decision that seems important is whether the organization expects the area specialist to have an area program or only expects him to support existing county programs. If the area specialist is to have an area program, this must be defined, understood and accepted by both county staff members and area specialists.

Studies on Factors that Affect Extension Personnel's Perception of Their Roles

Gallaher and Santopolo (28, pp. 22-23) implied there is a relationship between the degree of knowledge an extension agent possesses in certain broad areas and the way he perceives his role. They said:

> A focus on roles should provide more relevant criteria for measuring agent success. Within this frame of reference, "success" is the ability to establish, maintain, and utilize the human relationships necessary to achieve relevant learning experiences in the client. Involving people in an educational experience is a complex process that demands knowledge of social organization, social action, and motivation to a degree rarely attained by the average extension worker.
>
> However, unless his performance is judged against this background of expectations, an agent can hardly be expected to narrow the gap between "what is" and "what should be" in his role as a change agent. ...We suggest further than an agent who is sensitive to roles, hence to behavior as opposed to subject matter, can better evaluate his own skills in a given situation, and, thereby, make more accurate judgments of the need for other kinds of support from the knowledge center.

In an article by Gallaher (29, pp. 214-215) he makes reference to certain factors that influence an agent's perception of the roles he is to perform. He states:

> Extension agents are often called "change agents." And the work environment in which the extension agent relates to the client group focuses mainly on a concern for change. In this environment, the extension worker is expected to play a number of roles, either singly or in combination. Some of these roles involve maintenance of the work environment, whereas, others involve more the way an agent relates to the work environment and especially to the client aspect of it. The latter roles can all be subsumed under the rubric of change agent. By "change agent," I mean an individual who plays purposive roles designed to influence the process of change in a specific situation. The roles, defined with the client as referent are:

1. Analyst - the agent's main commitment is to intepret a situation for a client.

2. Advisor - the main commitment is to advise a client regarding alternatives applicable to a given situation.

3. Advocator - the main commitment is to recommend to a client one from among a number of alternatives.

4. Innovator - the main commitment to the client is to create an innovation to satisfy a specific client need.

Blalock (26, pp. 78-80) identified certain factors that influence legislator's perception of extension roles. He stated:

> Legislators were classified as low, medium, or high according to (1) the degree of knowledge about extension, (2) their degree of appraisal or approval of the organization and the job it has been doing, and (3) their concept of the scope or extent of extension's responsibilities as a public agency. The relationship between these factors and the legislators' perception of extension were analyzed. ...Each of the three factors used as a basis for classifying legislators had some association with the legislators' perception of extension. Their appraisal of extension (how well satisfied they were with the organization) was more clearly associated with their perceptions than the other two factors.

A study conducted by Strickland (41, pp. 227-248) dealt with the perceptual views of selected county officials and extension agents regarding the extent to which uniformity or differences of opinion existed with reference to future extension programs, objectives and mission. Specifically, perceptions were sought with regard to:

1. Familiarity with the 13 major areas of extension work in Alabama and opinions relating to future manpower resource allocations within the major areas of work.
2. The present extension service involvement and future obligation to urban and rural clientele.

3. The extension service role, responsibility, and function in the future.

Strickland found that there were variations of opinion among the respondents relating to the variables considered in the study. The findings suggested that most respondents viewed the extension service of future years in the traditional role of agriculture, home economics, and 4-H club work. State staff specialists were the only respondence group that tended to depart significantly from this viewpoint.

The study noted numerous areas in which county commission chairmen and extension council presidents were unfamiliar with present extension service operations. It was found, however, they agreed that the highest order of importance for program emphasis in the future should be placed on (1) improving farm income; (2) marketing, utilization, distribution, and farm supply; (3) food and nutrition; and (4) 4-H youth development. It was found that the extension service should be involved in industrial development provided manpower allocation to the rural sector is maintained.

A strong sentiment was found among respondents for maintaining extension agents primarily in county units. There was little support for area or multi-county staffing.

A number of studies have been conducted relative to the factors that influence the extension agent's perception of one job category, i.e., 4-H agent. Cassell (36) reports that there was far greater agreement among members of Wisconsin supervisory teams when they evaluated an agricultural agent than when they evaluated a 4-H

agent and that it likely occurs because members of the supervisory staff were not in agreement on what the 4-H agent ought to be doing. Robinson (40) suggested that apparently supervisors do not have common criteria for evaluating 4-H agents, as they have for other job catagories. Also, considerable variations have been found between county extension agents and officers of 4-H leaders associations with respect to expectations of the role of 4-H agents. Likewise, Biever (35) found differences in expectations between 4-H agents and members of agricultural committees, Aker (33) between adult and junior leaders and Duncan (38) between the way 4-H agents see their role and the way they think local leaders see it.

Theoretical Orientation and Summary

Perception, one of the focal concepts of this study, was defined in terms which emphasized that perception involves more than the perceiver becoming aware of objects, qualities, or relations by means of the sense organs. Perception is also influenced by set and prior experiences. Further, that the desirability of a situation to the perceiver is estimated in reference to internalized norms. That which conforms to these norms and possesses the most likelihood of yielding satisfaction, tends to be most readily perceived.

The assertion that set and prior experiences play a significant role in perceptions was further reinforced by the literature cited.

The three major characteristics of perception stated by Ittelson and Cantril (7, p. 587), the description of the perceptional field by Combs and Snygg (2, p. 20), the concept "selective vigilance" as described by Bruner and Postman (27, p. 142) and the effect of one's

values on perception as noted by Jones (8, p. 236) all tend to legitimize the procedure of obtaining some measures of individuals' prior experiences and environment and testing the relationship between these measures and a construct as held by a perceiver. Thus, for the purpose of this study, the relationship of common measures of the experiences and environment of personnel of the MCES, i.e., perceived general role of extension, sex, academic degree attainment, months of service with MCES, position held within the organization, race, evaluation rating, and work location were tested against a measure of the construct held by MCES personnel of the positions of area agent and area specialist.

With the relationship between prior experiences and perception serving as the basic theoretical question for this study, other sections of the review of literature provided linkage with the existing body of knowlege on related subjects.

The section on "Role Defined" provided the cognitive framework by which the concept "role" was treated within the context of this study.

The section on "Perceptual Studies of the Extension Service's Role" provided insight into the changing role of the extension service over a period of years as noted in the "Kepner Report" (21), the "Scope Report" (24) and "A People and A Spirit" (19). These studies provided the basis for the subclassification of the role of the extension service into items that could be incorporated into a scale for measuring how personnel of the MCES perceive the general role of extension. The quantitative measures which this scale

produced for each respondent was used as an independent variable in this study. A review of the perceptual studies, i.e., "Kepner Report," "The Scope Report," and "A People and A Spirit" also provided the basis for characterizing the role of the extension service into continuant categories.

All three of these studies, especially, "A People and A Spirit," support the position that the extension service should continue the type of educational programs it is now conducting in the areas of agricultural production and marketing, 4-H youth development, family living, and community resource development, however, the recommendations for the future which these studies cite imply the need for broader based programming by the extension service. This type programming requires the extension service to become the public's point of contact for the entire land-grant university, the United States Department of Agriculture, and other related governmental agencies. In other words, to provide a broad range of educational services to meet the many and various educational needs of the people extension serves. These contrasting views of the extension service's role for the purpose of this study are placed upon a continuum. One end of the continuum may be designated by the term "traditional." Those MCES personnel who are interested in maintaining "status quo" and perceive the future role of the organization as a continuation of the type programming now being conducted are seen as gravitating toward the "traditional" end of the continuum. The opposite end of the continuum may be designated by the term "innovative." The MCES personnel whose perception of the future role of Extension is not

restricted by the subject matter, methods and programming techniques now being utilized but are inclined to focus attention upon discovering, considering and meeting the needs of learners by whatever means that are most appropriate are seen as gravitating toward the "innovative" end of this continuum. This rationale provided the basis for determining the weighted values to be applied to the Likert-type scales which were used to obtain a quantitative measure for one of the independent variables, i.e., perceived general role of extension and the dependent variables, i.e., perceived role of area specialists and area agents.

An analysis of the Area Specialization Studies cited in the review of literature served the purpose of identifying items to be included into the Likert-type scales which were used in this study to obtain a measure from each respondent of their perceived role of area specialists and area agents. This was particularly true of the Zettle study (42) since its purpose was to develop a generic job description for extension area specialists. The job description that was developed as a result of the study identified many of the important administrative relationships and job tasks that should be considered in establishing area positions. These served as core items in the scale construction process undertaken to complete this study.

The section of the review of literature which included studies on factors that affect extension personnel's perception of their roles provided additional insight which helped to identify the factors that should be selected and measured and used as independent variables for the purpose of this study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Study Objectives and Hypotheses

The major objectives of this study were as follows:

1. To determine how personnel of the MCES perceive the role of area specialists and area agents.
2. To determine how personnel of the MCES perceive the general role of the extension service.
3. To determine if certain variables, i.e., perceived general role of extension, job classification, sex, academic degree attainment, tenure, race, evaluation rating, or work location of MCES personnel influence how they perceive the role of area specialists and area agents.

The perception of MCES personnel was associated to the selected independent variables by testing the following null hypotheses.

1. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their perception of the role of area specialists.
2. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their perception of the role of area agents.

3. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
4. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area scpecialists.
5. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area agents.
6. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
7. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's sex and their perception of the role of area specialists.
8. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's sex and their perception of the role of area agents.
9. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's sex and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
10. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their perception of the role of area specialists.

11. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their perception of the role of area agents.
12. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
13. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's tenure and their perception of the role of area specialists.
14. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's tenure and their perception of the role of area agents.
15. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's tenure and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
16. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area specialists.
17. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area agents.
18. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's race and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

19. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their perception of the role of area specialists.
20. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their perception of the role of area agents.
21. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
22. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's work location and their perception of the role of area specialists.
23. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's work location and their perception of the role of area agents.
24. There will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's work location and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

The Population

At the time this study was undertaken there were 474 professional personnel employed by the MCES. Twenty of these employees were involved in the pre-test of the data gathering instrument, therefore, they were not asked to respond to the final instrument. Thus, 454 professional personnel made up the sample for this study.

Three hundred and fifty-nine, or 79 percent of the total population, returned completed responses. Of this total number, 288 or 80.2 percent were county and area level personnel and 71 or 19.8 percent were state level personnel.

Forty-eight or 13.4 percent of the respondents were black and 311 or 86.6 percent of the respondents were white. One hundred and twenty-eight or 35.7 percent of the respondents were female and 231 or 64.3 percent were male.

Development and Use of Data Gathering Instrument

The instrument used for gathering data for this study consisted of a mailed questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. The questionnaire contains three sections, i.e., (I) Role of Extension, (II) Role of Area Specialist, and (III) Role of Area Agent.

Since a measure of perception was necessary in order to determine values for one of the independent variables and the two dependent variables of the study, the questionnaire was constructed so as to form a Likert-type summated rating scale (14, pp. 366-370). This was accomplished by selecting a list of items that related to the role of extension, the role of area specialists and the role of area agents. The items selected were based upon ideas reflected in the review of literature on related studies and from conferences with administrative and supervisory personnel of the MCES. The original list contained 51 items. These 51 items were divided as follows: Section I, Role of Extension contained 11; Section II, Role of Area Specialist contained 20; and Section III, Role of Area Agent contained 20.

The 51 items were put in questionnaire form. Each item had five possible answers, i.e., strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. In placing score values, those responses which indicated a "traditional" perception received a score of one, whereas, those responses which indicated an "innovative" perception were assigned the value of five.

A stratified-random sample totaling 20 professional employees of MCES was selected and a copy of the original questionnaire mailed to the ones selected as a pre-test. All 20 respondents returned the pre-test questionnaire. These were then coded and a Spearman-Brown Formula (4, p. 381) used to test for internal consistency. The test produced an Alpha value of .7124 when all 51 items were included. Those items with an R (total) negative value or a value below .15 were removed and the Spearman-Brown Formula recomputed. This procedure was repeated three times which resulted in the final selection of 28 items. When only these 28 items were included, an Alpha value of .8807 was obtained. These 28 items were divided as follows: Section I, Role of Extension contained 9 items; Section II, Role of Area Specialists contained 9 items; and Section III, Role of Area Agents contained 10 items.

The revised questionnaire was then mailed to a total of 454 professional personnel of MCES. This included all professionals, except the 20 who had previously responded to the pre-test. When the final questionnaires were mailed each schedule number assigned was the employee number used by MCES to identify each employee. When each questionnaire was returned it was matched with the

employee's personnel file and all face data which was needed for the purpose of this study was recorded from these personnel files.

Treatment and Analysis of Data

Data from the questionnaires and each corresponding personnel file was coded and then punched on cards for computer analysis. All statistical tests and tabulations were performed at the Mississippi State University Computing Center.

The major statistical evaluation of this study involved the use of multiple regression, analysis of variance, t tests, and standardized partial regression coefficients.

Multiple regression was used since according to Ferguson (4, p. 401) the techniques of multiple correlation have practical application when it becomes necessary to combine a number of independent variables to provide the best possible estimate of the dependent variable. Even though this study was not designed specifically to predict the value of the dependent variable from knowledge of the independent variables, multiple regression analysis seemed appropriate to test the relationship between the independent variables used and the two dependent variables. The multiple regression technique produces a multiple regression coefficient, i.e., R^2. These R^2 values are normally used in equations which predict or estimate the value of an unknown variable from knowledge of the value of a known variable or set of variables. In this study the R^2 values were used only as an indicator of what portion of the variance for the dependent variable had been accounted for by the independent variables considered. Since R^2 does not provide the basis for making

probabilistic statements it was necessary, for the purpose of this study, to apply additional statistical procedures.

Therefore, an analysis of variance for each multiple regression was computed. This procedure produced an F value from which probabilistic statements could be made concerning the relationship between a combination of the independent variables and the dependent variable.

The next step involved applying a t test to each independent variable with regard to its relationship to the dependent variable. The t test results were used as a basis for accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses included in this study.

In order to provide further insight into the problem under consideration, an additional statistical procedure was added. This involved the computation of standardized partial regression coefficients for each independent variable. This was done in order to obtain some measure of the relative influence that each independent variable had upon the dependent variable.

The .10 level of significance was used as the confidence level point for the rejection of the null hypothesis. This decision was basically influenced by the objectives of the study as well as the nature of the data under consideration. One of the major objectives was to determine if certain variables associated with extension personnel influenced how they perceived the role of area specialized positions. Since it was only possible within the scope of this study to gather data on a relatively small number of variables it seemed justified to set a confidence level which would reduce the chances of

a Type I error, thus, eliminating certain variable, from the limited number, which may deserve consideration. Also, the practical application of the conclusions, and implications that may result from the findings of this study are not by nature so critical that an unrealistic confidence level is necessary.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents a descriptive and statistical analysis of the data gathered for this study. The findings are organized under three main subheadings: (1) Descriptive Analysis of Responses to Questionnaire Items, (2) Evaluation of Hypotheses, and (3) Analysis of the Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables.

Descriptive Analysis of Responses to Questionnaire Items

Section I - Role of Extension - The frequency distribution of responses by items for this section is shown in Table 1.

In analyzing the data shown in Table 1, the reader is reminded that the score value of "1" represents a "traditional" perception of the role of extension and the score value of "5" represents an "innovative" perception of the role of extension. On eight of the items in Section I, responses from personnel of the MCES tended to cluster toward the "innovative" end of the perception scale. The only exception was with regard to item "6". On this item 65.46 percent of the responses were on the "traditional" end of the perception scale. The frequency distribution pattern may tend to indicate that the items in Section I did not discriminate in measuring MCES personnel's perception of the role of extension. However, the composite scores on Section I ranged from a low of 20 to a high of 48. If the frequency distribution of these scores was plotted it would tend to simulate a normal distribution curve.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY ITEM
IN SECTION I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire Item No.	Frequency Distribution by Percentage				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. It would be a good thing if extension only had to be concerned with serving commerical farmers	.56	2.79	1.67	37.05	57.94
2. Extension workers are too busy to develop special programs for low-income farmers	1.39	3.06	5.57	51.25	38.72
3. The 4-H program should be expanded in an effort to involve more young people	.84	1.95	6.13	47.63	43.45
4. The reason many low-income youth don't participate in 4-H is because they are just not interested in improving themselves	2.23	16.43	10.03	46.80	24.51
5. Serving organized Homemakers Clubs should be the primary function of an extension home economist	2.51	8.08	5.57	46.52	37.33
6. Special home economics programs for low-income families should take priority over the regular home economics programs	11.42	54.04	13.09	16.99	4.46
7. Extension should turn community development work over to the Economic Development Districts and other development organizations	2.51	10.86	20.06	48.47	18.11

Continued

TABLE 1
(CONTINUED)

Questionnaire Item No.	Frequency Distribution by Percentage				
	1	2	3	4	5
8. Environmental issues are too controversial for extension workers to get involved	2.23	7.52	11.42	62.12	16.71
9. The term "continuing education" more adequately describes the role of an extension worker than does the term "educational services"	2.79	19.50	8.64	53.48	15.60

Section II - Role of Area Specialists - The frequency distribution of responses by item for this section is shown in Table 2.

MCES personnel's perception on four of the items in Section II, i.e., numbers 10, 11, 13, and 16, tended to cluster toward the "innovative" end of the perception scale. On two items, i.e., numbers 12 and 15, responses tended to be fairly evenly distributed between a "traditional" and "innovative" perception of the role of area specialists. On three of the items, i.e., numbers 14, 17, and 18, responses tended to cluster toward the "traditional" end of the perception scale.

The composite scores on Section II ranged from a low of 13 to a high of 42. As was the case with the composite score in Section I, a plotting of Section II scores would tend to fit a normal distribution curve.

Section III - Role of Area Agent - The frequency distribution of responses by items for this section is shown in Table 3.

Of the ten items included in Section III, MCES personnel's perception on four, i.e., numbers 19, 21, 24, and 26 tended to cluster toward the "innovative" end of the perception scale. On two of the items, i.e., numbers 20 and 23, responses tended to be fairly evenly distributed between a "traditional" and an "innovative" perception of the role of area agents. On four of the items, i.e., numbers 22, 25, 27, and 28, responses tended to cluster toward the "traditional" end of the perception scale.

The composite scores on Section III ranged from a low of 20 to a high of 43. As was the case with the composite score in Sections I

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY ITEM
IN SECTION II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire Item No.	Frequency Distribution by Percentage				
	1	2	3	4	5
10. An area specialist should carry on applied research in his subject matter field	2.51	14.76	10.03	60.45	12.26
11. An area specialist should assist county staffs in planning a county extension program	2.79	18.94	6.41	61.56	10.31
12. An area specialist should assist county staff members only when called upon to do so	9.47	39.21	6.41	38.72	6.13
13. An area specialist's primary responsibility should be to teach clientele in his subject matter field	1.95	18.66	6.69	59.89	12.81
14. An area specialist should inform county staff members prior to coming into county	32.03	50.14	4.18	11.70	1.95
15. An area specialist should be accompanied by a county staff member when he makes personal visits to council with clientele	13.09	31.75	8.08	36.49	10.58
16. An area specialist should plan educational projects on an area basis in addition to work with county programs	1.11	3.06	4.18	66.30	25.35

Continued

TABLE 2
(CONTINUED)

Questionnaire Item No.	Frequency Distribution by Percentage				
	1	2	3	4	5
17. An area specialist should independently recruit lay leaders for planning and carrying out area educational projects	14.48	48.75	14.48	18.38	3.90
18. An area specialist should independently hold subject matter meetings for clientele on an area basis	16.99	49.03	11.14	19.22	3.62

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY ITEM
IN SECTION III OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire Item No.	Frequency Distribution by Percentage				
	1	2	3	4	5
19. An area agent should work entirely independently of county staff members	1.67	3.06	3.34	50.97	40.95
20. An area agent should assist county staff members only when called upon to do so	6.96	39.55	8.91	39.00	5.57
21. An area agent's primary responsibility should be to teach clientele in his subject matter field	2.79	17.55	6.96	62.95	9.75
22. An area agent should inform county staff members prior to coming into county	23.40	57.10	3.06	13.93	2.51
23. An area agent should be accompanied by a county staff member when he makes personal visits to council with clientele	9.47	30.92	8.64	41.50	9.47
24. An area agent should plan educational projects on an area basis in addition to work with county programs	.84	5.29	4.74	75.21	13.93
25. An area agent should independently recruit lay leaders for planning and carrying out area educational projects	10.31	50.14	13.37	23.68	2.51

Continued

TABLE 3
(CONTINUED)

Questionnaire Item No.	Frequency Distribution by Percentage				
	1	2	3	4	5
26. An area agent should cooperate with agri-business firms, relevant groups, organizations and agencies in providing technical knowledge for effective planning	1.11	.84	4.46	77.16	16.43
27. An area agent should independently hold subject matter meetings for clientele on an area basis	10.86	52.65	11.42	22.56	2.51
28. County staffs should consider an area agent as an additional member of their staff	11.98	61.28	10.31	13.93	2.51

and II, a plotting of Section III composite scores would tend to fit a normal distribution curve.

Evaluation of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 4 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 4

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S PERCEIVED GENERAL ROLE OF EXTENSION AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.09439	1.746	.10

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of 1.746 indicated that there was a statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, the null hypothesis 1 which states there would not be a significant relationship is rejected.

Hypothesis 2: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 5 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 5

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S PERCEIVED GENERAL ROLE OF EXTENSION AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.01451	.293	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of .293 indicates there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their perception of the role of area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 2 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 3: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Table 6 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 6

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S PERCEIVED GENERAL ROLE OF EXTENSION AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.10512	1.128	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of 1.128 indicated that there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's perceived general role of extension and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 3 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 4: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 7 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 7

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S JOB CLASSIFICATION AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Job Classification	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Assistant County Agents and Assistant Home Economists	4.78637	2.327	.02
Associate County Agents and Associate Home Economists	6.26405	3.207	.01
Home Economists	7.27168	3.643	.001
County Leaders	7.87216	3.835	.001
Area Agents	5.57644	2.708	.01
Specialists	4.39630	2.990	.01
Department Heads and Program Leaders	.39204	.244	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. As the data in Table 7 indicates the computed t values for all job classifications exceeded the required 1.645 t value with the exception of the department heads and program leaders category. To reject the null hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area specialists only one job classification would be required to show a significant correlation with perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, since all but one of the job classifications were found to be statistically significant in relation to the role of area specialists the null hypothesis 4 is rejected.

Hypothesis 5: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significiant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 8 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 8

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S JOB CLASSIFICATION AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Job Classification	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Assistant County Agents and Assistant Home Economists	4.68825	2.488	.02
Associate County Agents and Associate Home Economists	4.16436	2.327	.02
Home Economists	5.04169	2.756	.01
County Leaders	4.70648	2.502	.02
Area Agents	4.47506	2.371	.02
Specialists	4.54585	3.373	.001
Department Heads and Program Leaders	1.30010	.884	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. As the data in Table 8 indicates the computed t values for all job classifications, with the exception of the department heads and program leaders category, exceeded the required 1.645 t value. To reject the null hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area agents, only one job classification would be required to show a statistically significant correlation with perception of the role of

area agents. Therefore, since all but one of the job classifications were found to be statistically significant in relation to the perceived role of area agents the null hypothesis 5 is rejected.

Hypothesis 6: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Table 9 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 9

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S JOB CLASSIFICATION AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Job Classification	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Assistant County Agents and Assistant Home Economists	9.04324	2.551	.02
Associate County Agents and Associate Home Economists	10.00853	2.973	.01
Home Economists	11.94864	3.472	.001
County Leaders	12.31518	3.480	.001
Area Agents	9.61187	2.708	.01
Specialists	8.72426	3.442	.001
Department Heads and Program Leaders	1.51750	.548	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. As the data in Table 9 indicates the computed t values for all job classifications with the exception of the department heads and program leaders

category exceeded the required 1.645 t value. To reject the null hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents, only one job classification would be required to show a statistically significant correlation with the combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, since all but one of the job classifications were found to be statistically significant at or above the .10 level in relation to the combined perception of area specialists and area agents the null hypothesis 6 is rejected.

Hypothesis 7: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's sex and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 10 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 10

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S SEX AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.42685	.780	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of .780 for this variable indicates there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's sex and their perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, the null hypothesis 7 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 8: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's sex and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 11 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 11

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S SEX AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.06686	.133	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of .133 for this variable shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's sex and their perception of the role of area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 8 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 9: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's sex and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Table 12 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 12

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S SEX AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.43134	.457	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of .457 for this variable shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's sex and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 9 which states that there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 10: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 13 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 13

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S ACADEMIC DEGREE ATTAINMENT AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Highest Degree Attained	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Bachelors	1.70098	1.231	n.s.
Masters	2.19533	1.503	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value for both the Bachelor's and Master's degrees failed to reach or exceed the required 1.645 value which would indicate that there was a statistically significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their perception of the role of area specialists. Since neither of the categories for this variable showed a statistically significant t value the null hypothesis 10 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 11: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 14 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 14

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S ACADEMIC DEGREE ATTAINMENT AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Highest Degree Attained	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Bachelors	.14315	.113	n.s.
Masters	.02737	.020	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value for both the Bachelor's and Master's degrees failed to reach the required 1.645 value which would indicate that there was a statistically significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their perception of the role of area agents. Since neither of the categories for this variable showed a statistically significant t value the null hypothesis 11 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 12: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Table 15 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S ACADEMIC DEGREE ATTAINMENT AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Highest Degree Attained	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Bachelors	1.83283	.769	n.s.
Masters	2.28231	.906	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t values for both the Bachelor's and Master's degrees failed to reach the required 1.645 value which would indicate that there was a statistically significant relationship between MCES personnel's academic degree attainment and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Since neither of the categories for this variable showed a statistically significant t value the null hypothesis 12 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 13: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's tenure and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 16 shows this statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 16

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S TENURE AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.00259	1.071	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with the appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of 1.071 for this variable shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's tenure and their perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, the null hypothesis 13 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 14: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's tenure and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 17 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 17

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S TENURE AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.00151	.683	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of .683 for this variable shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's tenure and their perception of the role of area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 14 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 15: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's tenure and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Table 18 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 18

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S TENURE AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.00413	.994	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of .994 for this variable shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's tenure and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 15 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 16: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 19 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 19

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S RACE AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
2.11268	2.660	.01

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of 2.660 for this variable shows there was a statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, the null hypothesis 16 which states there would be no significant relationship is rejected.

Hypothesis 17: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 20 shows the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 20

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S RACE AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
1.20830	1.660	.10

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with the appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of 1.660 shows there was a statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area agents. Therefore, the null hypothesis 17 which states there would be no significant relationship is rejected.

Hypothesis 18: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's race and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Table 21 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 21

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S RACE AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
3.30517	2.414	.02

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value of 2.414 shows there was a statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's race and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, null hypothesis 18 which states there would be no significant relationship is rejected.

Hypothesis 19: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 22 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 22

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S EVALUATION RATING AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.00543	.178	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with approximate degrees of freedom. The computed t value here of .178 shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, null hypothesis 19 which states that there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 20: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 23 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 23

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S EVALUATION RATING AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.02385	.854	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value here of .854 shows there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their perception of the role of area agents. Therefore, null hypothesis 20 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 21: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Table 24 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 24

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S EVALUATION RATING AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
.02210	.421	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with the appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t value here of .421 indicates there was no statistically significant correlation between MCES personnel's evaluation rating and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, null hypothesis 21 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 22: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's work location and their perception of the role of area specialists.

Table 25 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 25

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S WORK LOCATION AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Assigned Location	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Northeast District	.74475	.985	n.s.
Southeast District	1.10268	1.401	n.s.
Southwest District	.20189	.265	n.s.
Area Assignment	.58439	.491	n.s.
District	1.82342	.762	n.s.
State	2.18755	1.281	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t values for none of the work location categories met or exceeded the required t value of 1.645. Thus, no statistically significant correlation is shown between MCES personnel's work location and their perception of the role of area specialists. Therefore, null hypothesis 22 which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 23: This hypothesis stated that there will not be a significant relationship between MCES personnel's work location and their perception of the role of area agents.

Table 26 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 26

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S WORK LOCATION AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA AGENTS

Assigned Location	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Northeast District	.11860	.171	n.s.
Southeast District	.72654	1.007	n.s.
Southwest District	.65675	.941	n.s.
Area Assignment	1.68787	1.548	n.s.
District	.26485	.121	n.s.
State	1.27959	.817	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t values for none of the work location categories met or exceeded the required t value of 1.645. Thus, no statistically significant correlation is shown between MCES personnel's work location and their perception of the role of area agents. Therefore, null hypothesis 23 which states there would be no significant relationship is accepted.

Hypothesis 24: This hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between MCES personnel's work location and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Table 27 presents the statistical data for this hypothesis.

TABLE 27

RELATIONSHIP OF MCES PERSONNEL'S WORK LOCATION AND THEIR COMBINED PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS

Assigned Location	Regression Coefficient	Computed t Value	Level of Significance
Northeast District	.54813	.420	n.s.
Southeast District	.16259	.119	n.s.
Southwest District	.65126	.496	n.s.
Area Assignment	2.38100	1.161	n.s.
District	1.20939	.293	n.s.
State	.65202	.221	n.s.

A t value of 1.645 would be required to be significant at the .10 level with the appropriate degrees of freedom. The computed t values for none of the work location categories met or exceeded the required 1.645 t value. Thus, no statistically significant correlation was found to exist between MCES personnel's work location and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents. Therefore, null hypothesis 24, which states there would not be a significant relationship is accepted.

Analysis of the Relationship Between the Independent and Dependent Variables

In the preceeding section each of the independent variables, i.e., perceived general role of extension, job classification, sex, academic degree attainment, tenure, race, evaluation rating, and work location were considered separately with regard to their relationship to the dependent variables, i.e., perception of the role of area specialists, perception of the role of area agents, and combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

Analysis of variance was used to consider all independent variables simultaneously with regard to their relationship to the dependent variables under study. This section is devoted to a description of the findings which resulted from this analysis.

Three analysis of variance problems were computed. The first used MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists as the dependent variable. The second used MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents as the dependent variable and the third used MCES personnel's combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents as the dependent variable.

When MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists was considered as the dependent variable, the test produced a F value of 5.033. For the appropriate degrees of freedom a F value of 1.92 would be required to be statistically significant at the .01 level. Since the F value of 5.033 computed from this data exceeded the required table value of 1.92 then it was found that there was a statistically significant relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis of the data resulted in a computed R^2 value of .229 which implies that even though a statistically significant relationship was found between the independent and dependent variables that only a relatively small, .229, amount of the variance for the dependent variable has been accounted for by the independent variables considered here. However, in cases other than highly controlled experiments it is not uncommon for a multiple regression to produce a low R^2 value.

Standardized partial regression coefficients were computed for each independent variable in order to obtain some measure of the relative influence that each of the independent variables had upon the dependent variable.

Table 28 shows the rank order of the independent variables with regard to the value of the computed standardized partial regression coefficients. The larger the absolute value of the coefficient the more influence it has upon the dependent variable.

When MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents was considered as the dependent variable the test produced a F value of 2.614. For the appropriate degrees of freedom a F value of 1.92 would be required to be statistically significant at the .01 level. Since the computed F value for this test exceeded the required table value of 1.92 then, it was found that there was a statistically significant relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The computed R^2 value for the multiple regression was .134 which implies that even though a significant relationship was found to exist between the independent and dependent variables that only a relatively small, .134, amount of the variance for the dependent variable has been accounted for by the independent variables considered here.

Standardized partial regression coefficients were computed for each independent variable in order to obtain some measure of the relative influence that each of the independent variables had upon the dependent variable.

TABLE 28

RANK ORDER OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES BY COMPUTED VALUE OF STANDARDIZED PARTIAL REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS WITH THE PERCEIVED ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Independent Variable	Value of Partial Regression Coefficient	Rank
Home Economists	.77492	1
County Leaders	.69400	2
Associate County Agents and Associate Home Economists	.51870	3
Specialists	.31460	4
Assistant County Agents and Assistant Home Economists	.27911	5
Area Agents	.25104	6
Bachelor's Degree	.22883	7
State Assignment	.17858	8
Master's Degree	.17208	9
Race	.16177	10
Southeast District Assignment	.09934	11
Perceived Role of Extension	.09009	12
Northeast District Assignment	.06674	13
Months of Service	.06486	14
District Staff Assignment	.06055	15
Sex	.04599	16
Area Assignment	.03525	17
Department Heads and Program Leaders	.01925	18
Southwest District Assignment	.01769	19
Evaluation Score	.01008	20

Table 29 shows the rank order of the independent variables with regard to the value of the computed standardized partial regression coefficients. The larger the absolute value of the coefficient the more influence it has upon the dependent variable.

When MCES personnel's combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents was considered as the dependent variable the test produced a F value of 4.379. For the appropriate degrees of

TABLE 29

RANK ORDER OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES BY COMPUTED VALUE OF STANDARDIZED PARTIAL REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS WITH THE PERCEIVED ROLE OF AREA AGENTS AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Independent Variable	Value of Partial Regression Coefficient	Rank
Home Economists	.62158	1
County Leader	.48002	2
Associate County Agents and Associate Home Economists	.39894	3
Specialists	.37634	4
Assistant County Agents and Assistant Home Economists	.31629	5
Area Agents	.23307	6
State Staff Assignment	.12085	7
Area Staff Assignment	.11781	8
Race	.10703	9
Southeast District Assignment	.07572	10
Department Heads and Program Leaders	.07385	11
Southwest District Assignment	.06660	12
Evaluation Score	.05122	13
Months of Service	.04382	14
Master's Degree	.01675	15
Perceived Role of Extension	.01602	16
Northeast District Assignment	.01229	17
District Staff Assignment	.01017	18
Sex	.00833	19
Bachelor's Degree	.00330	20

freedom a F value of 1.92 would be required to be statistically significant at the .01 level. Since the computed F value for this test exceeded the required table value of 1.92, then it was found that there was a statistically significant relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The computed R^2 value for this multiple regression was .206 which implies that even though a significant relationship was found to exist between the

independent and dependent variables that only a relatively small, .206, amount of the variance for the dependent variable has been accounted for by the independent variables considered here.

Standardized partial regression coefficients were computed for each independent variable in order to obtain some measure of the relative influence that each of the independent variables had upon the dependent variable.

Table 30 shows the rank order of the independent variables with regard to the value of the computed standardized partial regression coefficients. The larger the absolute value of the coefficient the more influence it has upon the dependent variable.

One other general observation should be made concerning the correlation between the independent variables considered in this study. Ferguson (4, pp. 401-402) points out that in multiple regression analysis the relative contributions of the different variables is not a simple matter of direct comparison of the relative magnitudes of the regression coefficients but requires also a consideration of the correlation between independent variables. He continues by saying that, many times, the prediction achieved can be attributed to a relatively small number of variables. To guard against such a situation, investigators frequently attempt to identify independent variables which show a low correlation with each other. If two independent variables have a low correlation with each other, this indicates both are likely measuring different aspects of the dependent variable.

TABLE 30

RANK ORDER OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES BY COMPUTED VALUE OF STANDARDIZED PARTIAL REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS WITH THE COMBINED PERCEPTION OF ROLE OF AREA SPECIALISTS AND AREA AGENTS AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Independent Variable	Value of Partial Regression Coefficient	Rank
Home Economists	.74992	1
County Leaders	.63941	2
Associate County Agents and Associate Home Economists	.48810	3
Specialists	.36768	4
Area Agents	.25484	5
Assistant County Agents and Assistant Home Economists	.31058	6
Race	.14905	7
Bachelor's Degree	.14011	8
Master's Degree	.10920	9
Area Assignment	.08460	10
Months of Service	.06108	11
Perceived Role of Extension	.05909	12
Department Heads and Program Leaders	.04388	13
Southwest District Assignment	.03362	14
State Staff Assignment	.03134	15
Northeast District Assignment	.02893	16
Sex	.02737	17
Evaluation Score	.02415	18
District Staff Assignment	.02365	19
Southeast District Assignment	.00862	20

A review of the correlation coefficients between all independent variables considered in this study indicates that the correlation between these variables is low except in a few expected cases where the correlation coefficient exceeds .50, e.g., home economist and sex; county agent and sex; and Master's degree and state staff position; etc.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study was involved with first determining MCES personnel's perception of (1) the role of extension, (2) the role of area specialists, and (3) the role of area agents. A second function was to determine the relationship between a number of independent variables and MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists and the role of area agents.

MCES personnel's perception of the role of extension, the role of area specialists and the role of area agents were obtained by each respondent being scored on a 1 to 5 scale. The assigned score value of 1 represented a "traditional" perception and the assigned value of 5 represented an "innovative" perception. A composite score was then computed for each respondent with regard to their perception of the role of extension, their perception of the role of area specialists and their perception of the role of area agents.

The respondents' composite scores for the role of extension were used as one of the independent variables. The respondents' composite scores for the role of area specialists and area agents and a combination of these scores were used as the dependent variables.

The independent variables were classified into discrete classes as required by the statistical procedure used. The data

for each independent variable except MCES personnel's perception of the general role of extension was obtained from the respective official personnel records for each respondent.

A frequency distribution was computed as to the percentage breakdown for each item on the three scales that comprised the questionnaire, i.e., perception of role of extension, perception of role of area specialists, and perception of role of area agents.

Three multiple regression problems were computed. The first considered the MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists as the dependent variable, the second considered MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents as a dependent variable, and the third considered the combined scores of MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.

The information utilized from the multiple regression program to which the data was applied included: A correlation coefficient between all independent variables considered in the study; the regression coefficient and computed t value for each independent variable as they were tested for their relationship to the three dependent variables; the computed F values for each of the three multiple regression problems; and the standardized partial regression coefficients computed for each of the three multiple regression problems.

Findings

The principal findings which resulted from this study were as follows:

1. A substantial majority of MCES personnel tended to indicate an "innovative" perception of the role of extension.
2. MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists tended to be only slightly weighted toward what may be termed as "innovative."
3. MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents tended to be fairly evenly distributed between a "traditional" and "innovative" perception.
4. There was a significant relationship between MCES personnel's perceived role of extension and their perception of the role of area specialists.
5. There was a significant relationship found between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area specialists.
6. There was a significant relationship found between MCES personnel's job classification and their perception of the role of area agents.
7. There was a significant relationship between MCES personnel's job classification and their combined scores with regard to their perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
8. There was a significant relationship found between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area specialists.

9. There was a significant relationship found between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of area agents.
10. There was a significant relationship found between MCES personnel's race and their combined scores with regard to their perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
11. No significant relationship was found to exist between any of the other independent variables when they were considered in relation to the three dependent variables, i.e., MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists, MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents and MCES personnel's combined scores with regard to their perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
12. When all the independent variables were considered together, a significant relationship was found to exist between them and the dependent variable, i.e., MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists.
13. When all the independent variables were considered together, a significant relationship was found to exist between them and the dependent variable, i.e., MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents.

14. When all the independent variables were considered together, a significant relationship was found to exist between them and the dependent variable, i.e., MCES personnel's combined scores with regard to their perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
15. It was found that the independent variables considered in this study account only for a relatively small amount of the variance measured for the three dependent variables, i.e., MCES personnel's perception of the role of area specialists, MCES personnel's perception of the role of area agents, and MCES personnel's combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents.
16. The MCES personnel's job classification more strongly influenced their perception of the role of area specialists, their perception of the role of area agents and their combined perception of the role of area specialists and area agents than does any of the other independent variables considered.

Conclusions

Conclusions which seemed to be valid from an interpretation of the findings included:

1. MCES personnel generally possess an "innovative" perception of the role of extension, i.e., when the role of extension is expressed in fairly general terms which may not be readily interpreted by extension personnel with regard to the individual role they would necessarily have to assume if MCES carries out its role in an "innovative" manner.

   Constant efforts by administrative and program personnel at the national, regional, and state levels to create among extension personnel an "innovative" perception of the role of extension may have contributed to the "innovative" perception of the role of extension generally possessed by MCES personnel.

2. MCES personnel seem to readily accept such activities to be performed by area specialists as carrying on applied research, assisting county staffs in program planning, teaching clientele, and conducting area educational projects. MCES personnel are fairly evenly divided in their opinions as to whether an area specialist should take the initiative in becoming involved in county programs or whether area specialists should visit clientele in a county without being accompanied by a county staff member. MCES personnel seem to resist such activities by area specialists as visiting a county

without informing a county staff member prior to the visit, independently recruiting lay leaders for planning and carrying out area educational projects, and independently holding subject matter meetings for clientele on an area basis. When the items are more closely examined with regard to which ones MCES personnel accept and to which they resist then it might be concluded that those items which may be interpreted as having the least affect upon the present role of county personnel are more readily accepted and those that have the most affect upon the role of county personnel tend to create resistance. This is especially true for those items which may alter the relationship between county staff members and the clientele they serve within their respective counties.

3. MCES personnel seem to readily accept such activities to be performed by area agents as working independently of county staff members; teaching clientele; planning educational activites on an area basis; and working with agribusiness firms, relevant groups, organizations and agencies. MCES personnel are fairly well divided in the opinions as to whether area agents should take the initiative in becoming involved in county programs and visiting clientele in a county without being accompanied by a county staff member.

MCES personnel seem to resist such activities by area agents as coming into a county without the county staff having prior knowledge of the visit; independently recruiting lay leaders for the purpose of planning and carrying out area educational projects; independently holding subject matter meetings for clientele on an area basis. MCES personnel also generally view an area agent as only another county staff member.

As is the case with MCES personnel's opinions with regard to the role of area specialist, MCES personnel seem to more readily accept those activities by area agents that may have the least affect on changing the role of county staff members and tend to resist those activities which may have the most affect on changing the role of county staff members. This is especially true for those activities by area agents which may alter the relationship between county staff members and the clientele they serve within their respective counties.

4. The findings would indicate that even though MCES has devoted considerable staff training in an effort to have area programming accepted by MCES personnel that many MCES employees still favor county programming over area programming when they are giving an opportunity to choose one or the other.

5. The establishment of area specialist positions and the area programming associated with these positions is one of the latest major innovative techniques adapted by the organization. Therefore, the relationship that was found to exist between MCES personnel's perceived role of extension and their perception of the role of area specialists may have been as a result of MCES personnel readily relating this new staffing approach to their generally held "innovative" perception of the role of extension.
6. As was pointed out in the statement of the problem section in Chapter I, a role cannot be performed alone; it must always have a counterpart. Thus, confusion on the part of one performer spreads to those who are performing with him. In light of this statement by Bernard (1, p. 43), it is not surprising that as one considers the various job classifications in MCES along with their respective roles which all interface at some point with the role of area specialists and area agents that a significant relationship was found to exist between job classifications and the perceived role of area specialized positions. And further, of all the independent variables considered, job classification was shown to have more influence in how MCES personnel perceived the role of the area positions than any of the others. This may imply

that there still exists within the MCES organization a lack of understanding and acceptance of the role of the area positions. This statement seems to be justified when the fact is considered that the data for job classification is coded in such a way that the administrative and supervisory staff serves as the base against which the other job classifications in the organization are compared. Since the administrative and supervisory staff are the major decision-makers in the organization and it was basically their decision to initiate the area staffing and programming approach it seems logical to assume that their perception of the role of the area position would be "innovative." When the regression coefficients for all other job classifications are examined, it is noted that they all have negative values. This indicates that all job classification's perception of the role of the area positions differ from that of the administrative and supervisory staff and, as pointed out, this difference is statistically significant.

7. A significant relationship was found to exist between MCES personnel's race and their perception of the role of the area positions. The data for the variable was coded in such a manner that the perception by blacks within the organization was used as the base. An examination of the regression coefficients for this

variable shows a positive value and the relationships were determined to be statistically significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that whites within the organization generally hold a more "innovative" perception of the role of the area positions than do the blacks.

8. From a theoretical perspective the fact is pointed out that when all independent variables were considered together as to their relationship to the perceived role of the area positions that these relationships were statistically significant at above the .01 level. This would seem to empirically reinforce the findings and conclusions by other researchers cited in the review of literature with regard to the affect of prior experiences and environment as they relate to perception. This conclusion was made in light of the fact that the independent variables tend to measure certain aspects of MCES personnel's prior experience and environment and when all of the independent variables were considered together, a significant relationship was found to exist between them and the way MCES personnel perceived the role of the area positions.

Implications

Based upon the findings and conclusions which have resulted from this study, the following implications are stated:

1. Since MCES personnel generally possess an "innovative" perception of the role of extension, any future training conducted for the purpose of creating among MCES personnel a more "innovative" perception of the role of the area positions should be related back to the "innovative" perception of the role of extension generally held by members of the organization. For example, 91.08 percent of MCES personnel tend to have an "innovative" perception with regard to expanding the 4-H program in an effort to involve more young people. Therefore, in future staff training it should be emphasized how area 4-H youth specialists can contribute to the achievement of this well accepted objective.
2. Among all job classifications that exist within MCES there is a variation of opinions as to the role of the area positions. This indicates a lack of understanding of the role of the area positions which likely lead to role conflict. Therefore, MCES should take steps to revise and update job descriptions for all positions within the organization. Particular attention should be given to the job descriptions for area positions to insure that role conflicts between these and other job classifications are held to a minimum. This process of revising and updating job descriptions should involve personnel that represent all job classifications in the

organization to insure that these various viewpoints are considered in the formulation of the final documents.

3. New employees of the MCES should receive training which would familiarize them with the job descriptions for each job classification. Periodically, training should be held for all employees to insure that they maintain a cognitive comprehension of the role of the various position categories.
4. MCES personnel's perception of the role of Extension could be measured periodically to determine if the perception possessed by a majority of the personnel differs greatly from the perception of the role of extension held by the organization's principal decision-makers. These findings could serve as a guide for developing the organization's inservice training program.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Bernard, Jessie. Social Problems at Midcentury. New York: The Dryden Press, 1959.

2. Combs, A. W. and D. Snygg. Individual Behavior. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.

3. Dember, W. N. The Psychology of Perception. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.

4. Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

5. Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern. Exploration in Role Analysis. New York: John W. Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

6. Hilgard, Ernest R. Introduction to Psychology. 2nd ed., New York: Harcount, Brace and Company, 1957.

7. Ittelson, William H. and Hadley Cantril. Perception. New York: Random House, 1954.

8. Jones, E. E. Foundations of Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1967.

9. Matthews, Joseph L. "The Cooperative Extension Service," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the USA, 1960.

10. Newcomb, Theordore M. Social Psychology. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

11. Parson, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.

12. Sanders, H. C., et al. The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentiss-Hall, Inc., 1966.

13. Sargent, Stansfeld. "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology" in John H. Rohner and Muyafer Sherif (editors), Social Psychology at the Crossroads. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

14. Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

15. Stodgill, Ralph M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.

16. Webster, Daniel. Webster's New World Dictionary. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1967.

17. Weiss, Thomas M., et al. Psychological Foundations of Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1963.

18. Znaniecki, Florian. The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Government Documents and Reports

19. A People and A Spirit. A report of the joint United States Department of Agriculture and National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Study Committee, November, 1968.

20. Datson, Robert S., Fred P. Frutchey, and Ralph E. Groening. "County Extension Organization and Financing Procedures-Summary of Study." Washington, D. C.: Federal Extension Service, 1962.

21. Kepner, P. V., et al. The Scope of Extension's Educational Responsibility. A self-study report of the United States Department of Agricultural Extension Service Study Committee, January, 1946.

22. Memorandum of Understanding Between Mississippi State University and the United States Department of Agriculture, revised July 26, 1968.

23. U. S. Congress Public Law 83, 83rd Congress, Chapter 157, 1st Session, 1953.

24. U. S. Department of Agriculture. The Cooperative Extension Today--A Statement of Scope and Responsibility (a publication issued through the Extension Committeee on Organization and Policy of the American Associations of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities and the Federal Extension Service, 1959).

25. U. S. Federal Extension Service. "Area Agent Study--A Report of the Review of Multi-County Area Agents Operations in Thirteen States," by Buel Lampher, et al. Washington: Government Printing Office, April, 1965.

Periodicals

26. Blalock, T. C. "What Legislators Think of Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension. Vol. II, Number 2, 1964.

27. Bruner, J. S. and L. Postman. "Tension and Tension Release as Organizing Factors in Perception," Journal of Personality. Vol. 15, 1947.

28. Gallaher, Art, Jr. and Frank A. Santopolo. "Perspective on Agent Roles," Journal of Cooperative Extension. Vol. V, No. 4, 1967.

29. _____. "The Agent as an Analyst," Journal of Cooperative Extension. Vol. V, No. 4, 1967.

Publications

30. Bertrand, Alvin L. Social Organization and Social Structure: A Modern System and Role Theory Perspective. Baton Rouge: Division of Continuing Education, Louisiana State University, 1970.

31. Johnson, Robert L. Area Extension Work: A Pilot Study. ES-1. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Extension Service, 1966.

32. Ross, Eugene. Factors Affecting the Allocation of County Resources. ES-2. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Extension Service, February, 1967.

Unpublished Materials

33. Aker, George F. "The Role of the Assistant County Agent as Perceived by 4-H Adult and Junior Leaders," (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1958.)

34. Bost, W. M. "New Wine, Old Bottles," address presented at the Annual Conference of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service at Biloxi, Mississippi, December 5, 1972.

35. Biever, L. J. "Roles of County Extension Agents as Perceived by County Agricultural Committee Members in Wisconsin," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957).

36. Cassell, Roy D. "The Effect of Supervisory Training Upon the Reliability of Two Appraisal Instruments in Evaluating the Relative Job Performance of County Extension Agents" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1962).

37. Deere, Runyan E. "An Analysis of the Nature of Change in Staffing the Cooperative Extension Service with Special Reference to the Educational Requirements of College Graduates" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965) cited by W. J. McIntyre, "An Evaluation of the Relative Effectiveness of Extension Work Under Two Different Systems of Personnel Assignment in Selected Indiana Counties" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1968).

38. Duncan, Dorothy E. "4-H Club Advisors' Concepts of Their Roles" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Winsconsin, 1957).

39. McIntyre, William J. "An Evaluation of the Relative Effectiveness of Extension Work Under Two Different Systems of Personnel Assignment in Selected Indiana Counties" (an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1968).

40. Robinson, Russell D. "Perception of the County 4-H Club Agent's Role in Wisconsin" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Winconsin, 1963).

41. Strickland, Elmer O. "Role Perceptions of the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service by Selected County Officials and Extension Agents" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, December, 1971).

42. Zettle, Frank S. "The Generic Job Description of the Extension Area Specialist" (an unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Wisconsin, 1964).

APPENDIX

Schedule Number:_____

Date:_____

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return to James R. Carpenter, P. O. Box 5446,
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

SECTION I - ROLE OF EXTENSION

This section contains a list of general statements about the Extension Service. The possible answers are (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

Read each statement and circle the answer that best expresses your opinion concerning the statement.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	2	3	4	5	(1)	It would be a good thing if Extension only had to be concerned with serving commercial farmers.
1	2	3	4	5	(2)	Extension workers are too busy to develop special programs for low-income farmers.
1	2	3	4	5	(3)	The 4-H program should be expanded in an effort to involve more young people.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	2	3	4	5	(4)	The reason many low-income youth don't participate in 4-H is because they are just not interested in improving themselves.
1	2	3	4	5	(5)	Serving organized Homemaker Clubs should be the primary function of an Extension Home Economist.
1	2	3	4	5	(6)	Special home economics programs for low-income families should not take priority over the regular home economics program.
1	2	3	4	5	(7)	Extension should turn community development work over to the Economic Development Districts and other development organizations.
1	2	3	4	5	(8)	Environmental issues are too controversial for Extension workers to get involved.
1	2	3	4	5	(9)	The term "continuing education" more adequately describes the role of an Extension worker than does the term "educational services."

SECTION II - ROLE OF AREA SPECIALIST

This section is designed to give you an opportunity to identify those roles that you think an area specialist should or should not perform.

For those roles listed below, please circle (1) if you strongly agree that the role should be performed by an area specialist, circle (2) if you agree, circle (3) if you are undecided, circle (4) if you disagree that this role should be performed by an area specialist and circle (5) if you strongly disagree.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1	2	3	4	5	(10) An area specialist should carry on applied research in his subject-matter field.
1	2	3	4	5	(11) An area specialist should assist county staffs in planning a county Extension program.
1	2	3	4	5	(12) An area specialist should assist county staff members only when called upon to do so.
1	2	3	4	5	(13) An area specialist's primary responsibility should be to teach clientele in his subject-matter field.
1	2	3	4	5	(14) An area specialist should inform county staff members prior to coming into county.
1	2	3	4	5	(15) An area specialist should be accompanied by a county staff member when he makes personal visits to counsel with clientele.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1	2	3	4	5	(16) An area specialist should plan educational projects on an area basis in addition to work with county programs.
1	2	3	4	5	(17) An area specialist should independently recruit lay leaders for planning and carrying out area educational projects.
1	2	3	4	5	(18) An area specialist should independently hold subject-matter meetings for clientele on area basis.

SECTION III - ROLE OF AREA AGENT

This section is designed to give you an opportunity to identify those roles that an area agent should or should not perform.

For those roles listed below, please circle (1) if you strongly agree that the role should be performed by an area agent, circle (2) if you agree, circle (3) if you are undecided, circle (4) if you disagree that the role should be performed by an area agent and circle (5) if you strongly disagree.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
1	2	3	4	5	(19)	An area agent should work entirely independently of county staff members.
1	2	3	4	5	(20)	An area agent should assist county staff members only when called upon to do so.
1	2	3	4	5	(21)	An area agent's primary responsibility should be to teach clientele in his subject-matter field.
1	2	3	4	5	(22)	An area agent should inform county staff members prior to coming into county.
1	2	3	4	5	(23)	An area agent should be accompanied by a county staff member when he makes personal visits to counsel with clientele.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1	2	3	4	5	(24) An area agent should plan educational projects on an area basis in addition to work with county programs.
1	2	3	4	5	(25) An area agent should independently recruit lay leaders for planning and carrying out area educational projects.
1	2	3	4	5	(26) An area agent should cooperate with agribusiness firms, relevant groups, organizations, and agencies in providing technical knowledge for effective planning.
1	2	3	4	5	(27) An area agent should independently hold subject-matter meetings for clientele on an area basis.
1	2	3	4	5	(28) County staffs should consider an area agent as an additional member of their staff.

VITA

James Ralph Carpenter was born on August 21, 1933, in Macon, Mississippi. He spent most of his early years on a small cotton and livestock farm near Macon.

He graduated from Macon High School, Macon, Mississippi in 1951. He entered Mississippi State University that fall and was graduated from that institution in May, 1955, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Administration. He earned a Master of Science in Sociology from Mississippi State University in 1967.

He served three and one-half years in the United States Army, and after being discharged from the service was employed by the Noxubee County Cooperative as Field Service Representative. In October, 1959, he was employed by the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service as Assistant County Agent in Leake County. He has since held the following positions with that organization: Associate County Agent, Resourse Development Specialist, Assistant Director and Associate Director.

The author married the former Henryse Cox of Charleston, Mississippi, in October, 1954. They have one son, Jay; and two daughters, Chris and Kelly.